R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 010 721 EC 000 010

DEVELOPMENT CENTERS FOR HANDICAPPED MINORS.
CALIFORNIA STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, SACRAMENTO

PUB DATE 1 MAR 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.88 22P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, *MENTALLY HANDICAPPED, *STATE LEGISLATION, *DAY CARE SERVICES, *CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTERS, STATE AID, SACRAMENTO

PROVISIONS FOR PILOT CHILD CARE CENTERS FOR PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED AND MENTALLY RETARDED MINORS WERE MADE BY THE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE IN 1959. ADDITIONAL FUNDS WERE PROVIDED IN 1961 AND 1965. BY NOVEMBER 1965, FOUR CENTERS WERE IN OPERATION AND FOUR MORE CENTERS WERE BEING ESTABLISHED. THESE EIGHT CENTERS SERVED 348 HANDICAPPED CHILDREN. AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED (1) REMOVAL OF THE CEILING ON THE NUMBER OF CENTERS AND (2) ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT. PROBLEMS OF STAFFING, TRANSPORTATION, AVAILABLE SPACE, LENGTH OF ACTIVITY TIME, FEES PAID BY PARENTS, EQUIPMENT, AND THE GREAT NUMBERS OF CHILDREN NOT SERVED BY THE PROGRAMS WERE ALSO NOTED. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR A DEVELOPMENT CENTER AND MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE WERE INCLUDED. (GB)

ED010721

EC 000 010

MAX RAFFERTY
Superintendent of Public Instruction
and Director of Education

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATE EDUCATION BUILDING, 721 CAPITOL AVENUE, SACRAMENTO 14

March 1, 1966

The California State Legislature
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, California 95814

Gentlemen:

The Department of Education herewith submits the report on Development Centers for Handicapped Minors as was done in 1959, 1961, and 1963 for the Pilot Child Care Centers for Physically Handicapped and Mentally Retarded Children.

This report covers matters resulting from changes authorized for the Development Centers for Handicapped Minors as the result of the passage of SB 499 (Chapter 1235, Statutes of 1965).

In transmitting this report we want to express our appreciation to the Legislature for its interest in this program and to gratefully acknowledge the cooperation and assistance to the Department of Education of the Advisory Committee in the implementation of Development Centers for Handicapped Minors.

Sincerely yours,

Max Rafferty

Enclosure

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DEVELOPMENT CENTERS FOR HANDICAPPED MINORS

Early Developments

The enactment of SB 499 (Short, Bradley, Holmdahl), Chapter 1235, Statutes of 1965, provided for modifications in the Pilot Child Care Centers for Physically Handicapped and Mentally Retarded Minors. The name of the centers was changed to Development Centers for Handicapped Minors. The centers were placed on a regular basis with the removal of language which had designated them as being pilot.

The concept of Development Centers was first formalized in 1957 when the Joint Interim Committee on Education and Rehabilitation of Handicapped Children and Adults took note of the number of mentally retarded and physically handicapped children seeking service in regular child care centers. Child Care Centers for Physically Handicapped and Mentally Retarded Children were authorized on a pilot basis in 1959 with the enactment of SB 740 (McBride, Teale, Johnson, Thompson), Chapter 2096, Statutes of 1959. Some $46,613 was placed in the regular child care appropriation for 1959-60 to cover the costs. There was, however, no school district that applied for approval to establish a center. A like amount was appropriated for 1960-61 but again no school district sought to establish a center.

In 1961 SB 1193 (Short) was enacted. As enacted the measure (1) modified the parent fee schedule to conform with that for regular child care centers, (2) elevated the maximum family income for charging of fees, and (3) doubled the amount of average hourly state support. On July 29, 1961, Stockton Unified School District was approved for the establishment of a center. Oakland Unified School District was approved August 8, 1962, for the second center.

The two centers established in Stockton and Oakland experienced great difficulty and were facing closure when SB 989 (Short) was introduced in 1963. Its enactment (1) authorized county superintendents of schools to establish and maintain centers, (2) increased the "means test" for families, (3) increased the amount of average hourly state support, (4) authorized matching state funds for transportation, and (5) provided funding for establishing two additional centers. The Santa Clara and Monterey County Superintendents of Schools were approved for establishing the two additional centers with operations of the former starting in November 1963 and for the latter in October 1964.

Implementation of SB 499

The enactment of SB 499 (Short, Bradley, Holmdahl), Chapter 1235, Statutes of 1965, brought further changes. These (1) authorized the continuance of the centers, (2) changed the name of the centers to Development Centers for Handicapped Minors, (3) increased the number of centers from four to eight, (4) appropriated $375,000 for the operation of the centers, (5) authorized allowances not to exceed $475 per child to cover cost of transportation, and (6) provided for consultative service in the Department of Education for the Development Centers for Handicapped Minors program. The Superintendent of Public Instruction advised school districts and county superintendents of schools in August, 1965, of the developments resulting from the passage of SB 499 and invited inquiries and applications.

An Advisory Committee, appointed pursuant to Education Code, Section 16645.26, developed criteria, procedure and a schedule for selecting applications for recommendation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for consideration for approval to establish centers (see Appendix A). Information and criteria were distributed to school districts and county superintendents of schools expressing an interest in Development Centers. Date for receipt of applications,

originally set for October 1, 1965, was extended an additional month to give districts and county offices more time to prepare applications.

Following the receipt and study of applications submitted, the Advisory Committee met in Northern and Southern California, November 16 and 17, 1965, respectively, to evaluate applications and to hear applicants present oral statements in support of their applications to establish Development Centers (see Appendix B). Presentations were made by each of the following eight applicants for the nine centers sought:

Applicant	Number of Centers
Berkeley Unified School District	1
Los Angeles Unified School District	1
San Diego Unified School District	1
San Francisco Unified School District	1
Little Lake City Elementary School District (Whittier Area Cooperative Special Education Program: East Whittier City Elementary, El Rancho Unified, Little Lake City Elementary, Los Nietos Elementary, Lowell Joint Elementary, South Whittier Elementary, Whittier City Elementary, and Whittier Union High School Districts)	1
Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools	2
Marin County Superintendent of Schools	1
Tulare County Superintendent of Schools	1

On November 17, 1965, the Advisory Committee, following study of the application document and the supporting oral presentations provided at the November 16-17 hearings, recommended the following four applications to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for consideration for approval:

Applicant	Number of Centers
San Diego Unified School District	1
San Francisco Unified School District	1
Los Angeles Unified School District	1
Little Lake City Elementary School District	1

In transmitting its recommendation to the Superintendent the Advisory Committee (1) reported its belief that all nine applications were of a quality

to warrant approval had the legislation and appropriation not restricted the number to four additional centers and (2) expressed the hope that the legislation would be changed to permit the establishment of Development Centers for Handicapped Minors throughout California as needed. The Advisory Committee found it difficult and frustrating not to be able to recognize the needs of handicapped children embraced in all of the applications for the nine centers. The members of the Advisory Committee grew even more troubled over the number of children in need of such centers when they noted the number of inquiries concerning such centers which did not culminate in applications (see Appendix C).

The Superintendent of Public Instruction on November 23, 1965, approved the applications for Development Centers for the four school systems as recommended to him by the Advisory Committee. As the result of this action, the eight centers authorized in Education Code, Section 16645.2, have now been approved. These include five unified school districts--Oakland, San Diego, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Stockton; one elementary district--Little Lake; and two county superintendents of schools--Monterey and Santa Clara. Of the four new centers just approved, San Diego got under way on January 3, 1966, and San Francisco on February 21, 1966. Both Los Angeles and Little Lake plan to start operation March 1, 1966.

Centers in Operation

In these eight established centers some 348 handicapped minors will be served. Sixty-seven are in the Stockton Center, 60 each in the Oakland and San Diego Centers, 40 each in the Little Lake and San Francisco Centers, 31 in the Monterey Center, and 25 each in the Los Angeles and Santa Clara Centers. Both Los Angeles and Santa Clara, because of existing severe space limitations, will not be able to admit additional handicapped minors.

Each of the eight communities approved for Development Centers has not been able to admit all handicapped minors needing such service. San Francisco, with 40 in attendance, reported in its application some 144 other minors already identified as eligible. Besides these eligibles San Francisco believes many, if not most, of the following ultimately would be found eligible for admission: 400 on the waiting list for admission to Sonoma State Hospital, 90 on waiting lists for community services, 7 and 34 on waiting lists for admission to public and private hospitals respectively, and 175 between the ages of 17 and 21 not included in the foregoing. San Diego, with 60 in attendance, reported 384 more identified as eligible plus 33 and 169 on waiting lists for admission to state hospitals and private programs respectively. Los Angeles Unified estimated some 2300 in the area as being likely candidates for admission. Los Angeles County, whose application to establish two centers could not be approved, reported 575 on waiting lists for admission to Pacific and Fairview State Hospitals plus an additional 638 presently in licensed private facilities.

In each area where there is a Development Center there are many children not being served who need the service offered. A greater need exists in the areas submitting applications for the five centers which the Advisory Committee could not recommend for approval because of the statutory restrictions to eight centers. Had the school systems listed in Appendix C submitted applications they, too, would have presented essentially a like number of handicapped minors needing Development Center services. There is no reason to assume that the existing need is any less in the many districts or counties which to date have neither submitted applications for, or made inquiry relative to, Development Centers for Handicapped Minors.

California is faced with a need for more Development Centers for Handicapped Minors than the eight authorized under current legislation. If the centers are to be utilized in meeting the need that exists, the Legislature should remove the present ceiling of eight centers. If the Legislature feels that the need should be met by a gradual increase in the number of centers to be established, this control should be achieved through the amount appropriated and charging the Department of Education with the task of determining the number of additional centers to be approved under the appropriation provided.

Although there have been increases in the level of state support for Development Centers, numerous parents contend that the present parent fee is prohibitive. There exists thinking among parents and those interested in the Development Center programs that the fees should be eliminated. They point out that these same children, were they less severely handicapped, would be enrolled in public school special education programs for which parents are not required to pay. Others take the position that if parent fees cannot be removed, the amount of such fees per month should not be permitted to exceed the $20.00 per month traditionally charged parents for a mentally retarded minor in a state hospital maintained by the Department of Mental Hygiene.

Development Center legislation has as one specific purpose the relief of parents to engage in work. If parents of handicapped minors are to have the benefit of this purpose, a Development Center must provide a program day of sufficient length to make it possible for the handicapped minor to attend for the period that the parent is at work. Only one of the eight approved centers is able to maintain a long enough program day to accommodate working parents. Centers having smaller enrollments are not able, under the present level of support, to maintain a program day of such length. If Development Centers are

to make it possible for parents to work, modification in financial support will be necessary.

Development Center programs, like programs provided in the state hospitals for the severely handicapped, tend to operate year around. Almost all operate for a longer period of time than do special education programs provided by the public schools. Some of the eight Development Centers point out that the $475 per average weekly paid membership allowable for transportation may be adequate for a program running 9½ months but is not adequate for a program maintained for 10, 11 or 12 months a year. One center providing a program on a year around basis and transporting 74 percent of the minors in attendance, reports the contract cost for transportation at $28,398 and the state allowance for transportation at $23,750. The district will have to take the $4,648 difference from other aspects of the center's program already inadequately provided and/or supported. There is some belief that the amount allowed for transportation should be proportionately increased as the length of the center's program is increased over that provided handicapped pupils in special education programs. This approach would make it possible to cover the transportation costs for Development Center programs operating for longer than 9½ months per year.

Development Centers for Handicapped Minors are discovering difficult staffing problems. In addition to the credentialed person in charge and permit teachers, there is need for ancillary or supportive staff service. Among these are psychologists, social workers, therapists, nurses, matrons, et cetera. The current support is hard pressed to carry the present minimal staffing and certainly is not high enough to provide for the supplementary staffing needs. Also, as efforts are made to upgrade the staff working with severely handicapped minors costs will become more competitive and budgetary increases will become necessary.

Currently the state contributes nothing to assist school systems starting Development Centers with capital costs for facilities, furniture and equipment. Random observations indicate that such costs have been a major factor in the failure of more school systems to apply for approval to establish centers. Finding physical plant with appropriate furniture and equipment appears to be impossible for many. Certainly the eight Development Centers now under way are far from being satisfactorily housed, furnished, and equipped. Also, several of these have very tenuous arrangements for their present facilities. Before too long they will be faced with the need to make other arrangements when the present owners seek to take back their facilities. Since many of the minors enrolled in the Development Center programs would otherwise have been enrolled in state hospitals, the state probably has an obligation to help local school systems with facility costs, furniture and equipment. Unless the state does assume a portion of such cost, many local school systems could be reluctant to apply for approval to establish Development Centers for Handicapped Minors.

APPENDIX A

Deadline date:
Nov. 1, 1965

Please submit
4 copies

CRITERIA
for
Approving Applications to Establish
Development Centers for Handicapped Minors

1. Applicant

   (a) name of school system
   (b) name and title of person to be contacted relative to questions concerning this application
   (c) address
   (d) telephone number

2. Authorization for Application

   (a) date board of education approved the submission of this application
   (b) if board approval has not been given, please give the date it will be submitted to the board for approval

3. Basis for submitting application

   (a) number of children identified as being in need of the program
   (b) number of these on waiting lists to hospitals
   (c) number of these on waiting lists to private programs
   (d) list the children by age distribution together with the disabilities of each which the center would expect to admit
   (e) enumerate the districts and/or counties which would be served by the center. If only the applicant district or county would be served, so state.

4. Readiness to undertake the program

   (a) Enumerate those school districts and/or county superintendents that are interested in having the applicant approved to establish a center
   (b) Enumerate those community groups (such as CASA, CCRC, UCP, Easter Seal, Community Welfare Council, et cetera) that are interested in having the applicant approved to establish a center.
   (c) Enumerate those local and state agencies (such as public health, mental hygiene, social welfare, rehabilitation, board of supervisors, et cetera) that are interested in having the applicant approved to establish a center.
   (d) Identify any of those enumerated in (a)(b) and (c) above which have agreed to help the applicant in establishing and maintaining the center and state what this help would be.

5. Community Planning for Multiply Handicapped Minors

(a) What community planning (Diagnostic-Counseling-Service Centers-half-way houses, sheltered workshops, residential rehabilitation centers, training of specialized personnel, et cetera) has taken place?
(b) How does the planning of the applicant relative to the Development Center fit into such larger planning?

6. Ancillary benefits

Enumerate and briefly describe any ancillary benefits, which would accrue if application is approved, such as

(a) observation and practicum opportunities for student professional personnel such as teachers, nurses, therapists, counselors, et cetera
(b) parent education
(c) other

7. Housing

(a) Describe the housing available as to type of building, size, number of children that can be accommodated satisfactorily, et cetera

(b) State how the housing is being made available by loan, lease, ownership, et cetera

(c) State whether the housing meets the standards of health, fire and safety regulations of local agencies having responsibility

8. Organization, Leadership, and Staff Factors

(a) Where will responsibility for the Center be placed in the applicants organizational structure?

(b) Who will be responsible for the direction and supervision of the Center?

(c) What staff will be provided?

(d) At what ratio will teaching staff to children be funded?

(e) What will be the composition of the Admission Committee?

9. Budget

(a) What is the proposed operation budget?

(b) Will the applicant's governing board be adverse approving an adequate budget if a tax would be required under E.C. 16645.12 or 16645.16?

10. Establishment Date

(a) When does applicant propose to start the Center if approved?

APPENDIX B

Minutes
Advisory Committee Meeting
Development Centers for Handicapped Minors
November 16-17, 1965

November 16, 1965, 10 a.m., Sacramento

1. Attendance

(a) Advisory Committee Members:

Present

Lucille Kennedy	Dept. of Social Welfare
Anthony N. Toto, M.D.	Dept. of Mental Hygiene
Charles R. Gardipee, M.D.	Dept. of Public Health
Charles W. Watson	Dept. of Education
Mrs. James G. Sevick	General Public
Al Tudyman	School System Maintaining a Center
Roger M. Walton	School System Maintaining a Center

Absent

Mrs. Edward L. Ghormley	Parent of a Handicapped Child

(b) Others:

Ronald Cox	Dept. of Education
F. W. Doyle	Dept. of Education
S. W. Patterson	Dept. of Education
John Weber	Dept. of Education
Ronald Rulofson	Dept. of Education
Leo Lippman	Health and Welfare Agency
Robert Whitenack	Berkeley Unified School District
Daryl A. Hopkins	Marin County Supt. of Schools
John L. Roberts	San Francisco Unified School District
Louis J. Rienzi	Tulare County Supt. of Schools
Jean Carter	California Council for Retarded Children
Sarah Jane Bullard	San Francisco Aid Retarded Children
Sue Clark	Contra Costa County Supt. of Schools
Mrs. Ann Trujillo	Munford Development Center, Stockton
Mrs. Edwina Serventi	Parent of Child at " "
Mrs. Bertha F. Kaminker	Mental Retardation Services Board, L.A.
Ivy Mooring	Mental Retardation Services Board, L.A.

2. Introductions

In the process of introductions Dr. Cox reported Mrs. Edward L. Ghormley, lay member and parent of a handicapped child, was unable to be present because of surgery in the family.

3. Organization of Committee - Selection of Chairman

Dr. Cox reminded the committee that as the result of action of the committee at the October 1, 1965, meeting, the first order of business would be the selection of a committee chairman.

Dr. Charles R. Gardipee was unanimously chosen chairman of the committee. At the request of Dr. Cox the newly chosen chairman assumed charge of the meeting.

4. Hearings - Applications for Development Centers for Handicapped Minors

Dr. Gardipee briefly outlined the purpose of the meeting as being that of hearing presentations by representatives of school systems applying for approval to establish Development Centers. He reported that there was to be a similar meeting in Los Angeles the following day, November 17, 1965, for the southern part of the state. He reported that the Advisory Committee, following the presentations in Los Angeles, would study the applications submitted and the presentations made and identify four applicants which the Advisory Committee would recommend to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for consideration for approval to establish centers. Dr. Gardipee, indicating there were applications for nine centers and that the legislation authorized but four, stated that the committee was faced with a difficult assignment. He expressed the hope that the committee would have the understanding and the sympathy of all concerned as it carried out its role.

The following school systems made presentations at the Sacramento meeting relative to their applications for Development Centers for Handicapped Minors:

Berkeley Unified School District - Robert Whitenack
Tulare County Superintendent of Schools - Louis J. Rienzi
San Francisco Unified School District - John L. Roberts
Marin County Superintendent of Schools - Daryl Hopkins

5. Committee Recesses

Following the foregoing presentations the Advisory Committee recessed to make flight connections to meet the following day in Los Angeles, November 17, 1965, 10 a.m.

November 17, 1965, 10 a.m., Los Angeles

1. Attendance

(a) Advisory Committee Members:

Present

All Advisory Committee members were present.

(b) Others:

Ronald Cox	Dept. of Education
S. W. Patterson	Dept. of Education
John Weber	Dept. of Education
Leo Lippman	Health and Welfare Agency
Chester Taft	Little Lake City Elem. School District
David H. Fils	Los Angeles County Supt. of Schools
Mrs. Diane Leichman	Los Angeles Unified School District
Martin Dean	San Diego Unified School District
Sylvia Zuckerman	Kennedy Child Study Center
Lorraine Silverstein	Exceptional Children Foundation
Winifred E. Smith	UCLA School of Social Welfare
Ray Nelson	United Cerebral Palsy Association
Alice Urssing	Exceptional Children Foundation
Bette D. Poore	Dept. of Public Health
Dr. Robert B. McIntyre	University of Southern California; AAMD
A. Nelson	Exceptional Children Foundation
Wallace J. Hutchens	Pasadena City Schools; L.A.C.A.S.E.
William F. Rinehart	Pres., Roosevelt School PTA, Pasadena
Mrs. Alison K. Mauer	Welfare Planning Council, L.A. Region
Mrs. Arlette B. Harwood	United Cerebral Palsy Association, L.A.
Mrs. Esther Freidman	Volunteer National Council of Jewish Women - Cerebral Palsy
Arthur B. Hansen	
Charles R. Moose	Interests of West San Fernando Valley
Mrs. Bonnie H. Moose	Interests of West San Fernando Valley
Mrs. Dean Phillips	L.A. County United Cerebral Palsy Assn.
Zev. W. Wanderer	Mental Retardation Services Board
Boris E. Bogatz	San Fernando Valley Association for Retarded Children
Daniel H. Zetland	Mental Retardation Services Board
Rev. Warren Firth	Methodist Church
Miriam Wilson, M.D.	USC and L.A. General Hospital
Herbert L. Rock	Los Angeles Children Hospital
Bertha F. Kaminker	Mental Retardation Services Board
Molly C. Gorelich	Exceptional Children Foundation
Frieda Craskin	Exceptional Children Foundation
Robert D. Shushan	Exceptional Children Foundation
Charles F. Nelson, M.D.	UCLA, College of Medicine
Shirley Dodson	Exceptional Children Foundation
Mrs. Harry B. Sefton	Public Interest
Mrs. John G. Zwolinski	UCPA, Bay Area Development Center
Mrs. Joseph Merlone	UCPA, Bay Area Development Center
Mrs. Mary Cutbirth	UCPA, Bay Area Development Center
Mrs. Gladys Boland	UCPA, Bay Area Development Center

2. Introductions

Dr. Gardipee opened the meeting by asking each person present to introduce himself and to briefly identify his interest and affiliation for the benefit of the committee and others present.

3. Hearings - Applications for Development Centers for Handicapped Minors

As in the case of the meeting in Sacramento the day before, Dr. Gardipee briefly outlined the purpose of the meeting and the procedure for the day.

The following school systems made presentations relative to their applications for Development Centers for Handicapped Minors:

Little Lake City Elementary School District - Chester Taft
Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools - David Fils
Los Angeles Unified School District - Diane Leichman
San Diego Unified School District - Martin Dean

Strong supporting presentations were made by many in attendance for the three applications in the Los Angeles area. Presentations of the representatives of Mental Retardation Services Board, UCP groups, colleges and universities, and medical authorities were especially noteworthy and of great value to the committee. Following the conclusion of the presentations of applicants, and in view of the fact that it was well past the customary lunch hour, the committee recessed for lunch before taking up the task of identifying four applications for recommendation for approval.

4. Applications Recommended for Approval

Coming together following lunch the Advisory Committee undertook a review of the applications before it and the information gained from the oral presentations provided by each of the applicants. The Advisory Committee then identified the following four applicants for recommendation to Dr. Max Rafferty, Superintendent of Public Instruction, for consideration for approval:

(1) San Francisco Unified School District
(2) Los Angeles Unified School District
(3) Little Lake City Elementary School District
(4) San Diego Unified School District

Following the identification of the foregoing applications, the Advisory Committee instructed the secretary of the committee to inform Dr. Rafferty of its recommendations and that in doing so he was (1) to report the committee's feeling that all applications were of a quality to warrant approval had the legislation made this possible and (2) to express the hope of the Advisory Committee that the legislation would be changed to permit approval of Development Centers for Handicapped Minors throughout California as needed.

The hour having been reached when members of the committee had need to depart to make travel connections, the meeting adjourned shortly after 3 p.m.

#

Attached is a copy of the communication prepared by the secretary of the committee to Dr. Rafferty concerning the committee's recommendations as the result of the instructions of the Advisory Committee.

COPY

Dr. Max Rafferty

November 18, 1965

C. W. Watson, Secretary
Advisory Committee, Development Centers for Handicapped Minors

Applications for Approval for Development Centers
for Handicapped Minors

The Advisory Committee, Development Centers for Handicapped Minors, meeting November 17, 1965, in Los Angeles, instructed me as its secretary to report to you that it recommends the following four applications from a total of nine for your approval to establish Development Centers for Handicapped Minors authorized by the enactment of SB 499 (Short), Chapter 1235, Statutes of 1965:

Little Lake City School District
Los Angeles Unified School District
San Diego Unified School District
San Francisco Unified School District

Attached for your information is a copy of a Brief of Applications for Development Centers for Handicapped Minors which was developed for the committee. Also attached is a copy of an informational letter sent to potential applicants along with a copy of Criteria to be utilized by applicants as a guide in developing their applications.

The Advisory Committee, in submitting its recommendation wishes to report that all nine applications for centers were of such merit as to warrant approval had the provisions of the enactment not restricted such recommendation to four centers. The Advisory Committee members found it extremely difficult not to be able to recognize the needs of handicapped children in all nine applications. Members repeatedly observed that the legislative authorization and funding should be such as to permit approval for Development Centers for Handicapped Minors throughout California wherever school district authorities or county superintendents of schools have identified handicapped children in need of the services such centers are designed to provide.

Enclosed for your use is a draft of a possible letter notifying applicants of approval and one for those that could not be approved because of the limitations of the legislation itself.

Dr. Doyle and Dr. Cox are fully knowledgeable concerning the work and recommendations of the Advisory Committee. It is my understanding that they expect you may wish to explore this subject further with them at an early meeting of the Cabinet.

CWW:ats
Attach.

cc: F. W. Doyle
R. W. Cox

APPENDIX C

Inquiries Received
Regarding
Development Centers for Handicapped Minors

Contra Costa County Superintendent of Schools
Cupertino Union Elementary School District
Humboldt County Superintendent of Schools
Kern County Superintendent of Schools
Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Santa Cruz County Superintendent of Schools
Shasta County Superintendent of Schools
Sonoma County Superintendent of Schools
El Dorado County Superintendent of Schools
Merced County Superintendent of Schools
San Mateo County Superintendent of Schools
Solano County Superintendent of Schools
Southwest School Districts Cooperative Special Education Program
(Centinela Valley Union High, El Segundo Unified,
Hawthorne, Inglewood Unified, Lawndale Elementary,
Lennox Elementary, Torrance Unified, and Wiseburn
Elementary School Districts)
Culver City Unified School District
Fremont Unified School District
Hayward Unified School District
Inglewood Unified School District
Long Beach Unified School District
Pasadena Unified School District
Pomona Unified School District
Sacramento Unified School District
San Juan Unified School District
Santa Maria City Elementary School District

In addition to the foregoing, numerous inquiries were received from private, nonprofit organizations concerning applications even though such bodies are ineligible under the legislation.